



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/520,987	08/10/2005	Carole Noutary	JG-ELK-5209/501100.20016	5208
26418	7590	01/28/2008		EXAMINER
REED SMITH, LLP				SHAH, MANISH S
ATTN: PATENT RECORDS DEPARTMENT				ART UNIT
599 LEXINGTON AVENUE, 29TH FLOOR				PAPER NUMBER
NEW YORK, NY 10022-7650			2853	
				MAIL DATE
				DELIVERY MODE
			01/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/520,987	NOUTARY, CAROLE
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Manish S. Shah	2853

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 November 2007.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-14 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of copending Application No. 10/470436.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter claimed in the instant application is disclosed in the co-pending application and is covered by the co-pending application claims.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laksin et al. (# WO 00/31189) in view of Mantell et al. (# EP 0779346).

Laksin et al. discloses:

- An ink-jet ink which is substantially free of water, volatile organic solvents and multifunctional (meth)acrylates (see Abstract; page: 12; line: 25-39), comprising at least one monofunctional (meth)acrylate monomer, at least one unsaturated ether monomer, at least one radical photoinitiator (page: 15, line: 1-39; page: 16, line: 10-40) and at least one coloring agent (page: 6, line: 15-39), the ink having a viscosity of less than 50 mPas at 25.degree C (page: 4, line: 30-35).

- An ink-jet ink, which is suitable for printing onto porous substrates (see Examples).

- The ink includes, by weight, from 2 to 15 parts of monofunctional (meth)acrylate monomer (see Examples).
 - The monofunctional (meth)acrylate monomer is selected from the esters of acrylic acid, for example octyl acrylate, decyl acrylate, isobornyl acrylate, phenoxyethyl acrylate, tetrahydrofuryl acrylate, 2-(2-ethoxyethoxy) ethylacrylate, and mixtures thereof (page: 15, line: 1-39; page: 16, line: 10-40), wherein the monofunctional (meth)acrylate monomer is present in an amount from 50 to 95% by weight, preferably from 60 to 80% by weight (see Examples).
 - The photoinitiator is a free radical photoinitiator, preferably selected from benzophenone, 1-hydroxycyclohexyl phenyl ketone, 2-benzyl-2-dimethylamino-(4-morpholinophenyl)butan-1-one, benzil dimethylketal, bis(2,6-dimethylbenzoyl)-2,4,4-trimethylpentylphosphine oxide or mixtures thereof, wherein the photoinitiator is present from 1 to 20% by weight, preferably from 4 to 10% by weight, of the ink (see Examples).
 - The ink includes a dispersible pigment as a coloring agent, wherein the dispersible pigment is present from 0.5 to 15% by weight, more preferably from 1 to 5% by weight, of the ink (page: 6, line: 15-39; see Examples).
 - A method of ink-jet printing, wherein the method uses the ink-jet ink as claimed onto porous substrate (see Example).

Laksin et al. discloses all the limitation of the ink composition except that the adding unsaturated ether monomer.

Mantell et al. teaches that addition of ethylene glycol monovinyl ether monomer confers satisfactory properties to an ink composition even without adding water (column: 4, line: 41-51).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to employ ethylene glycol monovinyl ether, as disclosed by Mantell et al. as the monomer containing a single terminal ethylenic group in the compositions disclosed by Laksin et al. in order to obtain an ink composition having a low viscosity. Laksin et al. provides motivation by teaching that a monomer having a single terminal ethylenic group can be combined with multifunctional acrylate monomers to achieve a low viscosity. Mantell et al. provides motivation by teaching that addition of ethylene glycol monovinyl ether monomer confers satisfactory properties to an ink composition, even without adding water. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated by a reasonable expectation of providing an ink jet ink composition free of water and having a low viscosity for ink jet printing, as taught by Mantell et al.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manish S. Shah whose telephone number is (571) 272-2152. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen D. Meier can be reached on (571) 272-2149. The fax phone

Application/Control Number:
10/520,987
Art Unit: 2853

Page 6

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Manish S. Shah
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2853

MSS

1/22/08